

Introductory Comments

I. Summary of the Office Action.

In the Office action, dated 19 June 2006, the Examiner asserted the following objections and rejections:

Upon reconsideration the Examiner rejoined the claims of Groups V and VI.

The Examiner requested that applicants update the priority statement in the present application.

The Examiner objected to the declaration.

The Examiner objected to Figure 3.

The Examiner objected to informalities in claims 11 and 14.

The Examiner rejected claims 14-19, 23 and 29-32 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, asserting that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The Examiner has rejected claims 11, 13-19 and 23-32 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, asserting that the specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

The Examiner objected to claim 12 as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

These objections and rejections are believed to be overcome in part by the amendments presented herein and are otherwise traversed for reasons discussed below.

II. Overview of the Amendments.

1. The Specification.

The amendments to the specification are presented herein below (after the signature page) in the section titled "Amendments to the Specification."